DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 331 HE 035 128

TITLE	Formula Funding Study: General Academic Institutions with Fewer Than 10,000 Students.
INSTITUTION	Texas State Higher Education Coordinating Board, Austin. Div. of Research, Campus Planning and Finance.
PUB DATE	2002-07-19
NOTE	16p.; "Directed by Rider 49, 77th Legislature." Appendixes contain small print.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.thecb.state.tx.us/reports/pdf/0469.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Finance; *Financial Support; *Funding Formulas; Higher Education; *Public Colleges; *Resource Allocation; State Legislation; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This report was produced in response to Rider 49 of the 2001 General Appropriations Act, which directed the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to study the effects of the funding formula on institutions of higher education with fewer than 10,000 students and determine the adequacy of the funding formula for these institutions in comparison with larger institutions. Formula funding accounts for 68% of state funding to all four-year General Academic institutions in fiscal year 2002. Additional state funding comes to the institutions from supplemental payments occurring outside of the formula. Studies of the adequacy of the formula for one size of institution versus another ignores a substantial portion of the funding received by all institutions, regardless of size. Without consideration of nonformula payments, the analysis does not show a discernable pattern indicating that the formula inadequately reimburses institutions with fewer than 10,000 students. However, a small school supplement is paid to institutions with fewer than 5,000 students, and there may be reason to believe that a similar supplement should be made available to the institutions with enrollments between 5,000 and 10,000 students. As an alternative, the Lieutenant Governor of Texas has suggested a greater proportion of the total funding could come directly from the formulas, eliminating much of the special, supplemental funding that currently exists. This could also eliminate or reduce the disparity between funding for larger versus smaller higher education institutions. Four appendixes discuss specifics of the formula funding and institutional enhancements. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 467 331

Formula Funding Study
General Academic Institutions
With Fewer Than 10,000 Students

Directed By
Rider 49
77th Legislature

July 19, 2002

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.B. Rester

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
Division of Finance, Campus Planning, and Research
P. O. Box 12788
Austin, Texas 78711
www.thecb.state.tx.us

HE035128

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board

Pamela P. Willeford (Chair)	Austin
Martin Basaldua, M.D. (Vice Chair)	Houston
Neal W. Adams	Bedford
Ricardo G. Cigarroa, Jr. M.D.	Laredo
Marc Cisneros	Corpus Christi
Kevin Eltife	Tyler
Jerry Farrington	Dallas
Raul B. Fernandez	San Antonio
Cathy Obriotti Green	San Antonio
Gerry Griffin	Hunt
Carey Hobbs	Waco
Adair Margo	El Paso
Lorraine Perryman	Odessa
Curtis E. Ransom	Dallas
Hector de Jesus Ruiz, Ph.D.	Austin
Robert W. Shepard	Harlingen
Windy Sitton	Lubbock
Terdema L. Ussery II	Dallas

Coordinating Board Mission

The mission of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is to provide the Legislature advice and comprehensive planning capability for higher education, to coordinate the effective delivery of higher education, to efficiently administer assigned statewide programs, and to advance higher education for the people of Texas.

THECB Strategic Plan

Coordinating Board Philosophy

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board will promote access to quality higher education across the state with the conviction that access without quality is mediocrity and that quality without access is unacceptable. The Board will be open, ethical, responsive, and committed to public service. The Board will approach its work with a sense of purpose and responsibility to the people of Texas and is committed to the best use of public monies.

THECB Strategic Plan

Table of Contents

		Page
Executive Summary		1
1.	Introduction	2
2.	Analysis -- Formula Funding	3
3.	Analysis -- Total Current Funds Expenditures for Instruction & Operations	4
4.	Analysis -- Non-Formula Funding	4
5.	Conclusions	6
6.	Recommendations	6

Appendices

Appendix 1: Total and Formula Appropriations per FTSE, FY 2002
Appendix 2: Instruction and Operations Expenditures per FTSE, FY 2001
Appendix 3: Percentage of Institutional Enhancements per FTSE and Headcount
Appendix 4: Percentage of Capital Equity and Excellence per FTSE and Headcount

Executive Summary

This report is produced in response to Rider 49 of the 2001 General Appropriations Act, which directed the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board to:

> "study the effects of the formula on institutions with fewer than 10,000 students and ... determine the adequacy of the formula for such institutions in comparison to institutions with larger student populations. The Coordinating Board shall report its finding to the Legislative Budget Board by September 1, 2002, with any recommendations for a small college and university formula funding method."

Formula funding accounts for 68 percent of state funding to all four-year General Academic institutions in FY 2002. Additional state funding comes to the institutions from supplemental payments occurring outside of the formula. Studies of the adequacy of the formula for one size of institution versus another ignores a substantial portion of the funding received by all institutions, regardless of size. Without consideration of non-formula payments, the analysis does not show a discernable pattern indicating that the formula inadequately reimburses institutions with fewer than 10,000 students. However, a small school supplement is paid to institutions with fewer than 5,000 students[1] and there may be reason to suggest that a similar supplement be made available to the institutions with enrollments between 5,000 and 10,000 students. Alternatively, as Lt. Governor Ratliff has suggested, a greater proportion of the total funding could come directly from the formulas, eliminating much of the special, supplemental funding that currently exists. This could also eliminate or reduce the disparity between funding for larger versus smaller higher education institutions.

[1] For the following analysis we have separated out the institutions with fewer than 5,000 students because the inclusion of the small school supplemental payments, which is considered part of the formula payment, significantly affects the results.

Introduction

Rider 49 of the General Appropriations Act, 77th legislature, is reproduced below:

> **Formula Funding Study.** In its biennial review of funding formulas for the general academic institutions, the Higher Education Coordinating Board shall study the effects of the formula on institutions with fewer than 10,000 students and shall determine the adequacy of the formula for such institutions in comparison to institutions with larger student populations. The Coordinating Board shall report its finding to the Legislative Budget Board by September 1, 2002, with any recommendations for a small college and university formula funding method.

For this analysis the Coordinating Board staff separated institutions into four categories: Group A, institutions with more than 10,000 students; Group B, institutions with fewer than 10,000, but more than 5,000 students; Group C, institutions with fewer than 5,000 students, and: Group D, institutions that only offer upper-division courses. This more discrete breakdown than that required in the rider allows consideration of the impact of the $750,000 annual small school supplement that is available only to institutions with fewer than 5,000 students.

An analysis of how these various groups of institutions spend their funds is provided as well. Particular attention is paid to expenditures in the Instruction category. Finally, a brief discussion of non-formula spending is also provided.

Analysis - Formula Funding

This analysis is based upon full-time student equivalents (FTSE), while the institutions, with the exception of Group D[2], are categorized by FY 2002 headcount. Appendix 1 provides these categories as well as total appropriations and the amount of funding provided via formula funding. The amount of formula spending and total spending per FTSE are also calculated. In summary:

- 13 institutions enroll more than 10,000 students (Group A)
- 12 institutions enroll between 5,000 and 10,000 (Group B)
- Six institutions enroll fewer than 5,000 students (Group C).
- Four institutions (Group D) offer upper-division courses only.

State appropriations for each group:

	Avg Total Appropriations per FTSE	Avg Formula Appropriations per FTSE	Formula % of Total
Group A	$7,164	$5,080	71%
Group B	$7,160	$4,420	62%
Group C	$11,432	$5,010	44%
Group D	$8,473	$5,775	68%

Total appropriations are higher for the Group C and Group D because all of Group C and three of the four Group D institutions receive the small school supplemental payment of $750,000 annually.[3]

[2] The inclusion of Group D institutions with their headcount counterparts tended to skew the results.

[3] While this payment is referred to as the "small school supplement," it is considered to be part of formula funding.

Analysis – Total Current Funds Expenditures for Instruction & Operations

A similar pattern exists when expenditures for Instruction & Operations are analyzed (see details in Appendix 2.) This appendix shows how the institutions incur expenditures per FTSE between various categories. This includes expenditures for Instruction, Academic Support, Student Services, and Institutional Support.

	Avg Formula Instruction per FTSE	Avg Total I&O Expenditure per FTSE	Instruction Percentage of I&O Expenditure
Group A	$4,858	$7,848	62%
Group B	$4,281	$7,042	61%
Group C	$4,930	$9,032	55%
Group D	$4,939	$9,998	49%

Groups C and D again benefit from the small school supplement, which increases total expenditures. The University of Texas at Austin spends the greatest amount for Instruction per FTSE ($7,361), as well as for the total spent per FTSE ($11,904). However, Sam Houston State University, also a Group A institution, has the second lowest per FTSE expenditures for Instruction ($3,080), and only exceeds two of the Group B institutions in total spending. Because of the small school supplement, only three of the Group A institutions exceed the average total spending per FTSE for Group C ($9,032), and only two of the Group A institutions exceed the average total spending per FTSE for Group D ($9,998).

Analysis – Non-Formula Funding

In addition to receiving formula funding, institutions also receive supplemental funding in the form of Institutional Enhancements (Appendix 3) and Capital Equity and Excellence funding (Appendix 4). Overall, Institutional Enhancements account for $134 million, or approximately a 7.5 percent add-on to the $1.8 billion in formula funding. Capital Equity and Excellence funding totaled $46 million, representing about a 2.5 percent add-on.

Appendix 3 clearly shows that all of the institutions with fewer that 10,000 students benefit from additional Institutional Enhancement funding:

- Group A institutions average $181 per FTSE.
- Group B institutions average $714 per FTSE.
- Group C institutions average $2,104 per FTSE.
- Group D institutions average $1,070 per FTSE.

Capital Equity and Excellence funding (Appendix 4) addresses reported inequities in capital funding between PUF- and HEAF-eligible institutions. These are funds provided

to institutions, "...for the purpose of acquisition, construction or improvement of ... facilities." Since the University of Texas at Austin and Texas A&M University receive substantial PUF funding, they do not receive Capital Equity and Excellence funding. Average funding per FTSE is roughly equal for Group A ($124) and Group (B) ($126). However, when UT-Austin and Texas A&M FTSE numbers are excluded, the average for Group A increases to $183 per FTSE. This funding is distributed in a reasonably proportionate manner.

- Group A accounts for 74 percent of all FTSEs, and receives 72 percent of Capital Equity and Excellence funding.
- Group B accounts for 21 percent of all FTSEs, and receives 20 percent of Capital Equity and Excellence funding.
- Group C accounts for 3 percent of all FTSEs, and receives 6 percent of Capital Equity and Excellence funding.
- Group D accounts for 2 percent of all FTSEs, and receives 2 percent of Capital Equity and Excellence funding.

Conclusions

Overall, 68 percent of total funding was appropriated to four-year General Academic institutions through the formula in FY 2002. Since the small school supplement, available to institutions with fewer than 5,000 students is considered part of the formula, it equalizes the formula appropriations for schools in that particular group. However, the institutions with student headcounts between 5,000 and 10,000 students still fall behind in formula funding. Institutional Enhancements and Capital Equity and Excellence funding helps equalize the funding. With these additions, average funding for the Group B institutions is only 2.3 percent less than average funding for Group A institutions:

- Group A institutions average $5,385 per FTSE.
- Group B institutions average $5,260 per FTSE.
- Group C institutions average $7,328 per FTSE.
- Group D institutions average $6,968 per FTSE.

Formula funding and supplemental appropriations are summarized below.

	Avg FTSE Formula Funding	Avg FTSE Institutional Enhancements	Avg FTSE Capital Equity and Excellence Funding	Totals
Group A	$5,080	$181	$124	$5,385
Group B	$4,420	$714	$126	$5,260
Group C	$5,010	$2,104	$214	$7,328
Group D	$5,775	$1,070	$124	$6,968

Recommendations

Since Institutional Enhancements and Capital Equity and Excellence funds are provided outside of the formula, the institutions that receive this money are necessarily required to "make their case" before the legislature each biennium to continue receiving these supplements. Lt. Governor Ratliff recently recommended in a legislative hearing that as much funding as possible be distributed through the formula, and the Coordinating Board staff is in agreement with this recommendation. Distributing funds through the formulas is an equitable solution since it treats all institutions the same.

Appendix 1

Total and Formula Appropriations per FTSE, FY 2002

Four-Year Institutions	TOTAL APPROP FY 2002	FORMULA APPROP FY 2002	FORMULA % of TOTAL	FTSE	FORMULA $ PER FTSE	Total $ PER FTSE	HEAD COUNT	% Graduate & Prof. SCH
1 UT Austin	386,487,170	287,848,622	74%	45,000	$6,397	$8,589	49,996	51%
2 Texas A&M University	318,277,266	224,408,840	71%	40,287	$5,570	$7,900	44,026	40%
3 University of Houston	202,084,064	148,468,681	73%	27,277	$5,443	$7,409	32,123	46%
4 University of North Texas	140,819,169	106,798,471	76%	23,355	$4,573	$6,030	27,054	34%
5 Texas Tech University	168,981,145	111,216,649	66%	22,904	$4,856	$7,378	24,199	35%
6 Southwest Texas State Univ.	101,351,723	77,525,311	76%	19,858	$3,904	$5,104	22,423	18%
7 UT Arlington	123,670,828	89,007,963	72%	16,573	$5,371	$7,462	20,424	41%
8 UT San Antonio	96,525,312	59,580,176	62%	15,071	$3,953	$6,405	18,830	19%
9 UT El Paso	90,802,974	54,032,702	60%	12,292	$4,396	$7,387	15,224	24%
10 UT Pan American	64,950,253	43,005,345	66%	10,921	$3,938	$5,947	12,760	17%
11 Sam Houston State University	59,812,603	42,497,819	71%	11,223	$3,787	$5,329	12,348	17%
12 Stephen F. Austin State Univ.	57,901,318	40,980,447	71%	10,833	$3,783	$5,345	11,453	16%
13 UT Dallas	83,367,773	58,498,831	70%	8,937	$6,546	$9,328	10,945	59%
Average - Group A			**71%**		**$5,080**	**$7,164**		**32%**
14 UH-Downtown	31,612,038	21,577,094	68%	6,726	$3,208	$4,700	8,951	0%
15 Lamar University	43,036,618	29,862,154	69%	7,242	$4,123	$5,943	8,568	25%
16 Texas Woman's University	62,146,693	45,905,018	74%	6,620	$6,934	$9,388	8,404	57%
17 Tarleton State University	39,620,727	26,998,408	68%	6,647	$4,062	$5,961	7,545	22%
18 Texas A&M - Commerce	41,910,946	30,407,915	73%	6,166	$4,932	$6,797	7,483	47%
19 Texas Southern University	60,607,265	32,175,448	53%	6,238	$5,158	$9,716	6,886	41%
20 Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	48,819,960	24,457,514	50%	5,883	$4,157	$8,298	6,823	27%
21 West Texas A&M University	36,605,312	23,597,806	64%	5,688	$4,149	$6,436	6,775	22%
22 Prairie View A&M University	56,134,628	26,692,137	48%	6,242	$4,276	$8,993	6,609	24%
23 Angelo State University	34,206,416	20,794,479	61%	5,678	$3,662	$6,024	6,290	11%
24 Texas A&M University - Kingsville	45,003,303	23,705,837	53%	5,400	$4,390	$8,334	5,942	30%
25 Midwestern State University	26,152,983	18,459,614	71%	4,913	$3,757	$5,323	5,812	15%
Average - Group B			**62%**		**$4,420**	**$7,160**		**27%**
26 UT Tyler	27,126,912	15,386,517	57%	2,675	$5,752	$10,141	3,592	21%
27 UT Brownsville	22,572,977	9,822,253	44%	1,913	$5,134	$11,800	3,157	27%
28 Texas A&M International University	35,056,134	11,118,162	32%	2,422	$4,590	$14,474	3,038	24%
29 UT Permian Basin	17,266,223	8,464,393	49%	1,785	$4,742	$9,673	2,272	22%
30 Sul Ross State University	18,756,633	8,746,122	47%	1,785	$4,900	$10,508	2,010	31%
31 Texas A&M Univ. at Galveston	14,979,645	5,951,698	40%	1,295	$4,596	$11,567	1,363	0%
Average - Group C			**44%**		**$5,010**	**$11,432**		**21%**
Total - Four-Year Institutions	**2,556,647,011**	**1,727,992,426**		**349,849**			**403,325**	
Average - Four-Year Institutions			**68%**		**$4,939**	**$7,308**		
Upper Level Only								
32 UH-Clear Lake	38,976,116	31,366,584	80%	5,401	$5,808	$7,216	7,580	50%
33 UH-Victoria	12,222,881	7,209,094	59%	1,184	$6,089	$10,323	1,698	55%
34 Texas A&M - Texarkana	10,071,786	4,694,891	47%	826	$5,684	$12,193	1,195	34%
35 Sul Ross State University Rio Grande College	6,361,318	2,825,084	44%	571	$4,948	$11,141	828	25%
Average - Group D			**68%**		**$5,775**	**$8,473**	**2,825**	**41%**
Total Upper-Level Institutions	**67,632,101**	**46,095,653**		**7,982**				
TOTAL ALL UNIVERSITIES	**2,624,279,112**	**1,774,088,079**	**68%**	**357,831**	**$4,958**	**$7,334**	**406,150**	

FTSE from BY 2001, Headcount from Fall 2001
Formula approp amounts found in MOF worksheet see link next cell
Formula appropriations do not include formula hold harmless.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 2

Instruction and Operations Expenditures per FTSE, FY 2001

		Instruction		Academic Support		Student Services		Institutional Support	
	Four-Year Institutions	$	FTSE %	$	FTSE %	$	FTSE %	$	FTSE %
1	UT Austin	$7,361	62%	$2,247	19%	$910	8%	$1,386	12%
2	Texas A&M University	$7,252	73%	$1,329	13%	$718	7%	$637	6%
3	University of Houston	$5,016	61%	$1,528	19%	$446	5%	$1,258	15%
4	University of North Texas	$4,684	61%	$1,390	18%	$553	7%	$1,055	14%
5	Texas Tech University	$5,389	60%	$1,740	19%	$764	8%	$1,162	13%
6	Southwest Texas State Univ.	$3,946	64%	$711	12%	$300	5%	$1,194	19%
7	UT Arlington	$4,381	59%	$1,266	17%	$671	9%	$1,085	15%
8	UT San Antonio	$3,961	58%	$772	11%	$855	13%	$1,205	18%
9	UT El Paso	$4,298	58%	$813	11%	$765	10%	$1,569	21%
10	UT Pan American	$3,760	60%	$719	12%	$713	11%	$1,049	17%
11	Sam Houston State University	$3,080	53%	$854	15%	$348	6%	$1,560	27%
12	Stephen F. Austin State Univ.	$4,032	69%	$519	9%	$359	6%	$905	16%
13	UT Dallas	$5,996	63%	$1,673	18%	$414	4%	$1,421	15%
	Average - Group A	**$4,858**	**62%**	**$1,197**	**15%**	**$601**	**8%**	**$1,191**	**16%**
14	UH-Downtown	$2,692	49%	$1,156	21%	$329	6%	$1,308	24%
15	Lamar University	$4,125	65%	$693	11%	$299	5%	$1,274	20%
16	Texas Woman's University	$5,727	63%	$989	11%	$705	8%	$1,731	19%
17	Tarleton State University	$3,850	62%	$916	15%	$477	8%	$933	15%
18	Texas A&M - Commerce	$4,438	62%	$832	12%	$733	10%	$1,171	16%
19	Texas Southern University	$5,396	55%	$1,232	13%	$892	9%	$2,304	23%
20	Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	$4,335	56%	$1,272	16%	$530	7%	$1,673	21%
21	West Texas A&M University	$3,521	61%	$854	15%	$613	11%	$791	14%
22	Prairie View A&M University	$4,012	54%	$881	12%	$920	12%	$1,554	21%
23	Angelo State University	$4,378	70%	$548	9%	$331	5%	$986	16%
24	Texas A&M University - Kingsville	$5,238	64%	$487	6%	$761	9%	$1,663	20%
25	Midwestern State University	$3,663	74%	$515	10%	$386	8%	$386	8%
	Average - Group B	**$4,281**	**61%**	**$865**	**12%**	**$581**	**8%**	**$1,315**	**18%**
26	UT Tyler	$5,835	55%	$1,630	15%	$772	7%	$2,413	23%
27	UT Brownsville	$3,831	59%	$949	15%	$602	9%	$1,119	17%
28	Texas A&M International University	$5,410	51%	$1,307	12%	$754	7%	$3,095	29%
29	UT Permian Basin	$3,910	53%	$1,452	20%	$541	7%	$1,521	20%
30	Sul Ross State University	$4,141	50%	$1,131	14%	$821	10%	$2,190	26%
31	Texas A&M Univ. at Galveston	$6,452	60%	$1,122	10%	$1,294	12%	$1,898	18%
	Average - Group C	**$4,930**	**55%**	**$1,265**	**14%**	**$797**	**9%**	**$2,039**	**22%**
	Average Four-Year Institutions	**$4,649**	**60%**	**$1,082**	**14%**	**$631**	**8%**	**$1,403**	**18%**
	Upper Division Institutions								
32	UH-Clear Lake	$4,287	54%	$1,385	18%	$433	5%	$1,807	23%
33	UH-Victoria	$5,053	48%	$2,442	23%	$510	5%	$2,584	24%
34	Texas A&M - Texarkana	$6,276	48%	$1,942	15%	$528	4%	$4,461	34%
35	Sul Ross State University Rio Grande College	$4,141	50%	$1,131	14%	$821	10%	$2,190	26%
	Average Group D	**$4,939**	**49%**	**$1,725**	**17%**	**$573**	**6%**	**$2,761**	**27%**
	Average All Institutions	**$4,682**	**58%**	**$1,155**	**14%**	**$625**	**8%**	**$1,558**	**19%**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 3

Percentage of Institution Enhancement per FTSE and Headcount

Four-Year Institutions	Institutional Enhancement	FTSE	Inst. Enhanc. Per FTSE	HEADCOUNT
UT Austin	$3,150,154	45,000	$70	49,996
Texas A&M University	$4,586,137	40,287	$114	44,026
University of Houston	$2,452,382	27,277	$90	32,123
University of North Texas	$1,065,809	23,355	$46	27,054
Texas Tech University	$5,771,978	22,904	$252	24,199
Southwest Texas State Univ.	$2,543,773	19,858	$128	22,423
UT Arlington	$1,287,494	16,573	$78	20,424
UT San Antonio	$4,288,157	15,071	$285	18,830
UT El Paso	$7,454,451	12,292	$606	15,224
UT Pan American	$7,616,054	10,921	$697	12,760
Sam Houston State University	$3,252,592	11,223	$290	12,348
Stephen F. Austin State Univ.	$3,007,919	10,833	$278	11,453
UT Dallas	$1,328,387	8,937	$149	10,945
Totals - Group A	**$47,805,287**	**264,531**		**301,805**
Average - Group A			**$181**	
UH-Downtown	$2,621,400	6,726	$390	8,951
Lamar University	$2,642,466	7,242	$365	8,568
Texas Woman's University	$2,485,832	6,620	$376	8,404
Tarleton State University	$8,645,078	6,647	$1,301	7,545
Texas A&M - Commerce	$2,345,340	6,166	$380	7,483
Texas Southern University	$5,296,515	6,238	$849	6,886
Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	$8,319,427	5,883	$1,414	6,823
West Texas A&M University	$3,485,117	5,688	$613	6,775
Prairie View A&M University	$3,757,506	6,242	$602	6,609
Angelo State University	$3,673,590	5,678	$647	6,290
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	$6,626,268	5,400	$1,227	5,942
Midwestern State University	$2,514,484	4,913	$512	5,812
Totals - Group B	**$52,413,023**	**73,443**		**86,088**
Average - Group B			**$714**	
UT Tyler	$3,791,811	2,675	$1,417	3,592
UT Brownsville	$5,415,744	1,913	$2,831	3,157
Texas A&M International University	$7,372,337	2,422	$3,044	3,038
UT Permian Basin	$2,360,853	1,785	$1,323	2,272
Sul Ross State University	$4,032,634	1,785	$2,259	2,010
Texas A&M Univ. at Galveston	$2,009,376	1,295	$1,552	1,363
Totals - Group C	**$24,982,755**	**11,875**		**15,432**
Average - Group C			**$2,104**	
TOTALS FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	**$125,201,065**	**349,849**		**403,325**
AVERAGES FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS			**$358**	
Upper Level Only				
Sul Ross State University Rio Grande College	$2,435,080	571	$4,265	828
Texas A&M - Texarkana	$2,084,376	826	$2,523	1,195
UH-Clear Lake	$2,009,369	5,401	$372	7,580
UH-Victoria	$2,009,374	1,184	$1,697	1,698
Totals - Group D	**$8,538,199**	**7,982**		**11,301**
Average - Group D			**$1,070**	
TOTALS ALL UNIVERSITIES	**$133,739,264**	**357,831**		**414,626**
AVERAGE ALL UNIVERSITIES			**$374**	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix 4

Percentage of Capital Equity and Excellence per FTSE and Headcount

Four-Year Institutions	Capital Eqty & Excellence	FTSE	Eqty & Excel Per FTSE	HEADCOUNT	Eqty & Excel Per HDCNT
UT Austin	$0	45,000	$0	49,996	$0
Texas A&M University	$0	40,287	$0	44,026	$0
University of Houston	$3,763,795	27,277	$138	32,123	$117
University of North Texas	$2,610,255	23,355	$112	27,054	$96
Texas Tech University	$3,036,030	22,904	$133	24,199	$125
Southwest Texas State Univ.	$2,096,932	19,858	$106	22,423	$94
UT Arlington	$5,254,197	16,573	$317	20,424	$257
UT San Antonio	$5,830,074	15,071	$387	18,830	$310
UT El Paso	$3,753,781	12,292	$305	15,224	$247
UT Pan American	$880,975	10,921	$81	12,760	$69
Sam Houston State University	$849,716	11,223	$76	12,348	$69
Stephen F. Austin State Univ.	$960,923	10,833	$89	11,453	$84
UT Dallas	$3,715,052	8,937	$416	10,945	$339
Totals - Group A	**$32,751,729**	**264,531**		**301,805**	
Average - Group A	**72%**	**74%**	**$124**		**$109**
Average w/out UT & TAMU			**$183**		
UH-Downtown	$789,616	6,726	$117	8,951	$88
Lamar University	$831,112	7,242	$115	8,568	$97
Texas Woman's University	$1,010,601	6,620	$153	8,404	$120
Tarleton State University	$1,115,601	6,647	$168	7,545	$148
Texas A&M - Commerce	$612,815	6,166	$99	7,483	$82
Texas Southern University	$896,744	6,238	$144	6,886	$130
Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi	$534,164	5,883	$91	6,823	$78
West Texas A&M University	$531,827	5,688	$93	6,775	$78
Prairie View A&M University	$1,437,239	6,242	$230	6,609	$217
Angelo State University	$563,005	5,678	$99	6,290	$90
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	$515,113	5,400	$95	5,942	$87
Midwestern State University	$435,688	4,913	$89	5,812	$75
Totals - Group B	**$9,273,523**	**73,443**		**86,088**	
Averages - Group B	**20%**	**21%**	**$126**		**$108**
UT Tyler	$967,373	2,675	$362	3,592	$269
UT Brownsville	$152,241	1,913	$80	3,157	$48
Texas A&M International University	$257,555	2,422	$106	3,038	$85
UT Permian Basin	$475,909	1,785	$267	2,272	$209
Sul Ross State University	$236,893	1,785	$133	2,010	$118
Texas A&M Univ. at Galveston	$451,967	1,295	$349	1,363	$332
Totals - Group C	**$2,541,938**	**11,875**		**15,432**	
Averages - Group C	**6%**	**3%**	**$214**		**$165**
TOTAL FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	**$44,567,189**	**349,849**		**403,325**	
AVERAGES FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS			**$127**		**$110**
Upper Level Only					
Sul Ross State University Rio Grande College	$38,620	571	$68	828	$47
Texas A&M - Texarkana	$148,724	826	$180	1,195	$124
UH-Clear Lake	$558,269	5,401	$103	7,580	$74
UH-Victoria	$240,273	1,184	$203	1,698	$142
Totals - Group D	**$985,886**	**7,982**		**11,301**	
Averages - Group D	**2%**	**2%**	**$124**		**$87**
TOTALS ALL UNIVERSITIES	**$45,553,075**	**357,831**		**414,626**	
AVERAGES ALL UNIVERSITIES			**$127**		**$110**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This document is available on the
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
World Wide Web site
http://www.thecb.state.tx.us

For further information contact:

Lynn Magee
Division of Finance, Campus Planning, and Research
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board
P. O. Box 12788
Austin, Texas 78711
(512) 427-6130 FAX: (512) 427-6147
lynn.magee@thecb.state.tx.us

Printed on Recycled Paper

The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age or disability in employment or the provision of services.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").